

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the claims of the instant application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

In the office action claims 1, 4, 10, 14, 15, 17 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of U.S. Patent No. 6, 101,393 ("the '393 patent") in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0003930 ("the '930 application"). Claims 2, 5, 8, 9, 11-12, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over the '393 patent in view of the '930 application and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,108,559 ("the '559 patent"). Claims 6-7, 9, 12-13, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over the '393 patent in view of U.S. Application Publication No. US 2003/0012348. Finally, claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the '930 application in view of the '393 patent. For at least the reasons stated below, the rejections are respectfully traversed.

It is submitted that contrary to the Examiner's assertion, the '930 application does not teach "responding to the routing query on behalf of the HLR of the home network to provide a modified address." There is no disclosure in the '930 application of a modified address. Instead it appears that the '930 patent teaches converting messages in GSM to IS-41 format and it is these formats that are used to interrogate the HLR. The converter then issues the required MSC address in GSM format to the SMSC. The routing node 100 does not provide a modified address on behalf of the HLR since the address retrieved from the HLR is not altered by the routing node. Accordingly, the combination of the '930 application and the '393 patent would not result in the device recited in independent claim 1.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that although the '930 application and the '393 patent are generally related to mobile telecommunications networks, each of these references addresses

separate problems. The '393 patent is concerned with problems of a single protocol domain to allow users to determine whether they want to receive messages from one or more particular sender. On the other hand the '930 application is concerned with addressing issues related to protocol mismatch. Because these two references are directed to addressing mutually exclusive problems it is submitted that there is no teach or suggestion in either of these documents which would direct one of skill in the art to the other, or suggest their combination. Further, as discussed above, even if combined the two references fail to teach each and every limitation of independent claim 1.

Therefore, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the relied upon portions of the '393 patent and the '930 application and is allowable. For similar or somewhat similar reasons, it is submitted that independent claims 17 and 21 also are patentably distinguished over the relied upon portions of the '393 patent and the '930 application and are also allowable.

It is further submitted that the shortcomings of the '393 patent are not addressed by either the '559 patent or the '348 application. Accordingly, claims 2, 4-16, 18, and 20-23 which depend from an allowable base claim are allowable therewith.

CONCLUSION

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosures in the cited reference, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By:


Ronald R. Santucci
Reg. No. 28,988
(212) 588-0800